

REMARKS

The Office Action objects to claim 11 because of a specified informality. Applicants have amended claim 11 to correct the informality per the Examiner's helpful suggestion.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iino (US 6,817,563) in view of McAllister et. al. (US 6,304,416).

Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, and 18 to more clearly distinguish over the prior art references. Claim 1, as amended, recites a magnetic-tape cartridge. A cartridge case has orthogonal walls in parallelepiped configuration and a slanted wall between two of the orthogonal walls. The slanted wall is recessed with respect to one of the orthogonal walls. A memory device is connected to an antenna capable of communication through a magnetic field propagated from the slanted wall along a plurality of transmission axes.

Applicants believe that neither Iino nor McAllister, taken singularly or in combination, teach or suggest a magnetic-tape cartridge with a case having a slanted wall which is recessed with respect to the orthogonal walls as claimed. Iino teaches a slanted wall 22 which is not recessed. McAllister does not teach a slanted wall.

Since neither reference fails to teach or suggest a recessed slanted wall, claim 1 as amended is believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art references, taken singularly or in combination.

Claims 2-10 are believed to be in condition for allowance as each is dependent from an allowable base claim.

Claim 11, as amended, is drawn to a system for communicating with a memory chip in a magnetic-tape cartridge. A case for the cartridge has orthogonal walls in parallelepiped configuration and a slanted wall between two of the orthogonal walls. A chip antenna is connected to said memory chip and alternatively disposed on an exterior surface of the slanted wall, or integrated into the slanted wall. The chip antenna is capable of communication through a magnetic field propagated from the slanted wall. A reading antenna is connected to an external reading device in magnetic field communication with the chip antenna.

Again, Applicants believe that neither Iino, nor McAllister teaches or suggests a chip antenna connected to a memory chip, and alternatively disposed on an exterior surface of the slanted wall, or integrated into the slanted wall as presently claimed. Iino does not teach a chip antenna. McAllister teaches an antenna provided within a tape cartridge for electromagnetic coupling, but does not teach the placement of the antenna either on an external surface of a slanted wall of the cartridge or incorporated into the slanted wall.

Since neither reference fails to teach or suggest alternatively an antenna disposed on an exterior surface of the slanted wall or incorporated into the slanted wall, claim 11 as amended is believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art references, taken singularly or in combination. Claims 12-17 are believed to be in condition for allowance as each depends from what is believed to be an allowable base claim.

Claim 18, as amended, is drawn to a method for transmitting data between a memory device in a magnetic-tape cartridge and an

USPTO Serial Number: 10/643,619
Applicants: Armando Jesus Argumedo et al.
Reply to Office Action dated April 25, 2006

external reading device, including providing a cartridge case having orthogonal walls in parallelepiped configuration and a slanted wall between two of said orthogonal walls, the slanted wall recessed with respect to one of said orthogonal walls, connecting the memory device to a chip antenna capable of communication through a magnetic field propagated from the slanted wall, providing a reading antenna connected to an external reading device in magnetic-field communication with the chip antenna, and transmitting data between said chip and reading antennas through said magnetic field propagated from the slanted wall.

Again, for reasons previously described, Applicants believe claim 18, as amended, distinguishes of the prior art of record, taken singularly, or in combination. Claims 19-23 are believed to be allowable dependent claims.

Applicants believe that all information and requirements for the application have been provided to the USPTO. If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of the Application, Applicant(s) invite the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney at the Examiner's convenience.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due with this Response to U.S. PTO Account No. 09-0449.

Respectfully submitted,
QUARLES & BRADY STREICH LANG LLP



Gavin Milczarek-Desai
Reg. No. 45,801

July 15, 2006